arXiv:1404.7261v1 [math.CO] 29 Apr 2014

Upper bound on cubicity in terms of boxicity for graphs of low chromatic number

L. Sunil Chandran[1], Rogers Mathew*[2], and Deepak Rajendraprasad*[2]

[1] Department of Computer Science and Automation,
Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India - 560012.
sunil@csa.iisc.ernet.in
[2] The Caesarea Rothschild Institute, Department of Computer Science,
University of Haifa, 31095, Haifa, Israel.
(rogersmathew,deepakmail)@gmail.com

April 30, 2014

Abstract

The boxicity (respectively cubicity) of a graph G is the minimum non-negative integer k, such that G can be represented as an intersection graph of axis-parallel k-dimensional boxes (respectively k-dimensional unit cubes) and is denoted by $\text{box}(G)$ (respectively $\text{cub}(G)$). It was shown by Adiga and Chandran (Journal of Graph Theory, 65(4), 2010) that for any graph G, $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)\lceil \log_2 \alpha \rceil$, where $\alpha = \alpha(G)$ is the cardinality of the maximum independent set in G. In this note we show that $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2\lceil \log_2 \chi(G) \rceil \text{box}(G) + \chi(G)\lceil \log_2 \alpha(G) \rceil$. In general, this result can provide a much better upper bound than that of Adiga and Chandran for graph classes with bounded chromatic number. For example, for bipartite graphs we get, $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2(\text{box}(G) + \lceil \log_2 \alpha(G) \rceil)$.

Moreover we show that for every positive integer k, there exist graphs with chromatic number k, such that for every $\epsilon > 0$, the value given by our upper bound is at most $(1+\epsilon)$ times their cubicity. Thus, our upper bound is almost tight.

Keywords: Boxicity, Cubicity, Chromatic Number.

1 Introduction

An *axis-parallel k-dimensional box*, or *k-box* in short, is the Cartesian product $R_1 \times R_2 \times \cdots \times R_k$ where each R_i is an interval of the form $[a_i, b_i]$ on the real line. A k-unit-cube (or k-cube in short) is a k-box where each R_i is an interval of the form $[a_i, a_i + 1]$. A graph $G(V, E)$ is said to be an *intersection graph* of k-boxes (respectively k-cubes) if there is a mapping f that maps the vertices of G to k-boxes (respectively k-cubes) such that for any two vertices $u, v \in V$, $(u, v) \in E(G) \Leftrightarrow f(u) \cap f(v) \neq \emptyset$. Then f is called a *k-box representation* of G (respectively k-cube representation). The *boxicity* (respectively *cubicity*) of a graph G, denoted by $\text{box}(G)$ (respectively $\text{cub}(G)$) is the minimum non-negative integer k such that G has a k-box representation (respectively k-cube representation). Only complete graphs have boxicity (cubicity) 0. The class of graphs with boxicity at most 1 is the class of interval graphs, and the class of graphs with cubicity at most 1 is the class of unit interval graphs.

*Supported by VATAT Post-doctoral Fellowship, Council of Higher Education, Israel.

In the rest of the paper we will always use n to denote the number of vertices of the graph being discussed. Logarithms will be to the base 2, unless otherwise specified.

Let H_1 and H_2 be two graphs such that $V(H_1) = V(H_2) = V(G)$ and $E(G) = E(H_1) \cap E(H_2)$. Then we write $G = H_1 \cap H_2$. The following observation was made by F. S. Roberts [23].

Lemma 1 ([23]). *Boxicity of a non-complete graph G is the minimum positive integer k such that there exists interval graphs $I_1, \ldots, I_k$ such that $G = I_1 \cap \cdots \cap I_k$. Cubicity of a non-complete graph G is the minimum positive integer k such that there exists k unit interval graphs $U_1, \ldots, U_k$ such that $G = U_1 \cap \ldots \cap U_k$.*

1.1 Brief literature survey

The concepts of boxicity and cubicity were introduced by F. S. Roberts [23] in 1968 for studying some problems in ecology. The computational complexity of finding the boxicity of a graph was studied by [26, 16]. It is known that it is NP-hard to decide whether the boxicity of a graph is at most 2 [22]. Recently it was shown that it is hard to even approximate within $n^{1-\epsilon}$, for any $\epsilon > 0$ unless NP=ZPP [8]. The best known approximation factor for boxicity is $O\left(\frac{n\sqrt{\log\log n}}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right)$ and that for cubicity is $O\left(\frac{n(\log\log n)^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\log n}}\right)$ [2].

Adiga et al. [3] showed that boxicity is closely related to the well-studied concept of partial order dimension. Chandran and Sivadasan [13] proved that for any graph G, $\text{box}(G) \leq \text{treewidth}(G)+2$. It is also known to be related to graph minors: Esperet and Joret [18] showed that for any graph G, $\text{box}(G) \in O(\eta^4 \log^2 \eta)$, where η is the number of vertices in the largest clique minor of G. Chatterjee and Ghosh [15] related boxicity with Ferrer's dimension. The upper bound for $\text{box}(G)$ in terms of maximum degree of G (denoted by $\Delta(G)$) was studied in [9, 17]. The current best known upper bound for $\text{box}(G)$ in terms of $\Delta(G) = \Delta$, is $O(\Delta \log^2 \Delta)$ [3], which follows from a corresponding upper bound for partial order dimension in terms of the maximum degree of the comparability graph of the partial order [20].

Boxicity of outerplanar graphs is known to be at most 2 [24]. Thomassen [25] showed that the boxicity of planar graphs is at most 3. Recently Felsner and Francis [19] gave a different proof for the above theorem. More proofs of this theorem are given in [7]. Hartman et al. showed that the boxicity of bipartite planar graphs is at most 2 [21]. Lower bounds for boxicity was studied in [6].

Chandran et al. [10] showed that for any graph G, $\text{cub}(G) \leq b + 1$, where b denotes the bandwidth of G. They also showed that $\text{cub}(G) = O(\Delta \log b)$. Chandran and Mathew [5] showed that for any graph G, $\text{cub}(G) \leq (k + 2)\lceil 2e \log n \rceil$, where k is the degeneracy of G. Chandran and Sivadasan [14] showed that for d-dimensional hypercubes H_d, $\text{cub}(H_d) = \theta\left(\frac{d}{\log d}\right)$. Adiga and Chandran [4] showed that for an interval graph G, $\lceil \log \psi \rceil \leq \text{cub}(G) \leq \lceil \log \psi \rceil + 2$, where ϕ denotes the number of leaves in the largest induced star in G.

1.2 Cubicity vs. boxicity

Clearly for any graph G, $\text{box}(G) \leq \text{cub}(G)$. Then the following question becomes relevant: Does there exists a function g such that $\text{cub}(G) \leq g(\text{box}(G))$? It is easy to see that the answer is negative: Consider a star graph on $n + 1$ vertices. Its cubicity is $\lceil \log n \rceil$ [23] whereas its boxicity is 1, since a star graph is an interval graph. Chandran and Mathew [12] showed that for any graph G, $\text{cub}(G) \leq \text{box}(G)\lceil \log n \rceil$, where n is the number of vertices. Adiga and Chandran [4] improved this result by showing that we can use the cardinality of the maximum independent set in G, denoted by $\alpha(G)$, in the place of n.

Lemma 2 ([4]). *For any graph G,* $\mathrm{cub}(G) \leq \mathrm{box}(G)\lceil \log \alpha(G) \rceil$.

Remark. We demonstrate next that the bound in the above lemma is tight, i.e., given any two positive integers b and α, we show that there exists a graph G with $\mathrm{box}(G) = b$, $\alpha(G) = \alpha$ and $\mathrm{cub}(G) = b\lceil \log \alpha \rceil$. It is known that a complete p-partite graph, $p \geq 2$, with $n_i, i \in [p]$, vertices in each part has boxicity p and cubicity $\sum_{i=1}^{p} \lceil \log n_i \rceil$ [23]. Hence, given positive integers b and α, if $b \geq 2$, the complete b-partite graph with α vertices in each part will serve our purpose. If $b = 1$, then a star graph on $\alpha + 1$ vertices gives the required graph.

We observe that, in a loose sense, the two terms in the upper bound on $\mathrm{cub}(G)$ given in Lemma 2, namely $\lceil \log \alpha(G) \rceil$ and $\mathrm{box}(G)$, by themselves contribute in keeping the cubicity of a graph high. Clearly $\mathrm{box}(G)$ is a lower bound for $\mathrm{cub}(G)$ since cubes are specialised boxes. The other term $\lceil \log \alpha(G) \rceil$ can make $\mathrm{cub}(G)$ high due to a geometric reason, captured in the so-called 'volume argument', which we reproduce here (also see [11]): Let $\mathrm{cub}(G) = k$. Then the vertices in the biggest independent set should correspond to pairwise non-intersecting k-dimensional unit cubes in the cube representation of G. Thus if we consider the minimal bounding box for the cube representation, that bounding box should have a volume of at least $\alpha(G)$ units. On the other hand, the width of this bounding box on any of the dimensions (i.e. the distance between the extreme points of the projection of the cube representation on the corresponding axis) can be at most $d + 1$ where d is the diameter of G. (To see this note that each vertex correspond to a unit length interval in the projection and the pair of vertices containing the two extreme points in their respective intervals, are at a distance of at most d in the graph, and thus it follows that the geometric distance between the two extreme points is at most $d + 1$.) From this it is clear that the volume of the minimal bounding box is at most $(d + 1)^k$. It follows that $(d + 1)^k \geq \alpha(G)$. From this we get $\mathrm{cub}(G) = k \geq \lceil \log_{d+1} \alpha(G) \rceil$. Thus we have $M = \max(\mathrm{box}(G), \lceil \log_{d+1} \alpha(G) \rceil) \leq \mathrm{cub}(G)$. It is natural to investigate whether there exists a function g such that $\mathrm{cub}(G) \leq g(M)$. But the answer is negative since we can increase the diameter of a graph unboundedly without affecting its cubicity. For example, if G is the graph obtained by identifying one end point of a path on $2n + 1$ vertices with the leaf of a star graph on $n + 1$ vertices, it is easy to check that $\mathrm{box}(G) = 1$, $\alpha(G) = 2n$, diameter of G $d = 2n+2$ and hence $M = \max\{\mathrm{box}(G), \lceil \log \alpha(G)/\log(d+1) \rceil\} = 1$, whereas $\mathrm{cub}(G) = \lceil \log n \rceil$ which is far higher.

In this paper we ask a simpler question: Let $\bar{M} = \max(\mathrm{box}(G), \lceil \log \alpha(G) \rceil)$. Lemma 2 tells us that $\mathrm{cub}(G) \in O(\bar{M}^2)$ and the remark after the lemma indicates that we cannot have anything better in general (choosing $\alpha = 2^b$ there illustrates the point). But can we show that $\mathrm{cub}(G) \in O(\bar{M})$ for some restricted graph classes? In this paper we show that if we restrict ourselves to classes of graphs whose chromatic number is bounded above by a constant, such a result can indeed be proved. In fact our main theorem is a general upper bound for cubicity in terms of boxicity, the independence number and chromatic number:

Theorem 3. *Let G be a graph with chromatic number $\chi(G)$ and the cardinality of the maximum independent set $\alpha(G)$. Then* $\mathrm{cub}(G) \leq 2\lceil \log \chi(G) \rceil \mathrm{box}(G) + \chi(G)\lceil \log \alpha(G) \rceil$.

For graphs of low chromatic number, this result can be in general far better than that of Adiga et al. [4]. The most interesting case is that of bipartite graphs:

Corollary 4. *For a bipartite graph G,* $\mathrm{cub}(G) \leq 2(\mathrm{box}(G) + \lceil \log \alpha(G) \rceil)$.

Remark. The reader may naturally wonder whether chromatic number is an upper bound for the boxicity of a graph or not, in which case, Theorem 3 cannot be an improvement over Lemma 2. On the contrary there are several graphs with boxicity greater than chromatic number. In fact it looks most graphs are like that: In [6] it is shown that almost all balanced bipartite graphs (on $2n$ vertices) have boxicity $\Omega(n)$. The proof can be modified to show that almost

all bipartite graphs with n vertices on one side and m vertices on the other, have boxicity $\Omega(\min(n, m))$.

1.3 Preliminaries

A graph G is a co-bipartite graph if the complement of it, $\overline{G}$ is a bipartite graph. Thus G is a co-bipartite graph if and only if the vertex set $V(G)$ can be partitioned into two sets A and B such that A and B both induce cliques in G. It is clear that for a co-bipartite graph G, $\alpha(G) \leq 2$. Applying Lemma 2 we can infer the following:

Lemma 5. *For a co-bipartite graph G,* $\text{cub}(G) = \text{box}(G)$.

Let G be a graph and let its vertex set $V(G)$ be partitioned into A and B. Now construct a graph H, with $V(H) = V(G)$ and $E(H) = E(G) \cup \{(u, v) : u, v \in A\} \cup \{(u, v) : u, v \in B\}$. Note that H is obtained from G by adding more edges so that A as well as B induce cliques in H and the edges across A and B are as in G. The following observation is from [1].

Lemma 6. $\text{box}(H) \leq 2\text{box}(G)$

2 Proof of Theorem 3

Let G be a graph with $\text{box}(G) = b$. Consider a proper coloring of G using $\chi(G) = \chi$ colors: Let $C_0, \ldots, C_{\chi-1}$ be the color classes with respect to this coloring. First we define $\lceil \log \chi \rceil$ bipartitions of $V(G)$ by the following rule: The bipartition (A_i, B_i) for $1 \leq i \leq \lceil \log \chi \rceil$ is obtained by setting A_i as the union of all the color classes C_j such that the i-th bit in the binary representation of j is 1. (Here we consider binary representation of numbers in $\{0, 1, \ldots, \chi - 1\}$ using $\lceil \log \chi \rceil$ bits). B_i is defined as the union of the remaining color classes. Define H_i to be the co-bipartite graph obtained by defining $V(H_i) = V(G)$ and the edge set $E(H_i) = E(G) \cup \{(u, v) : u, v \in A_i\} \cup \{(u, v) : u, v \in B_i\}$. That is, H_i is obtained by adding edges to G such that A_i and B_i induce cliques in the resulting graph, and the edges across A_i and B_i are as in G. Since H_i is a co-bipartite graph, by Lemma 5, $\text{cub}(H_i) = \text{box}(H_i)$. By Lemma 6, the $\text{box}(H_i) \leq 2\text{box}(G) = 2b$. Thus $\text{cub}(H_i) \leq 2b$. Therefore by Lemma 1 there exist $2b$ unit interval graphs, say $U_i^1, \ldots, U_i^{2b}$ such that

$$U_i^1 \cap \cdots \cap U_i^{2b} = H_i \tag{1}$$

Observation 7. *For $1 \leq i \leq \lceil \log \chi(G) \rceil$ and $1 \leq j \leq 2b$, U_i^j is a super graph of G.*

Proof. From equation 1 it is clear that U_i^j is a super graph of H_i which in turn is a super graph of G. □

Also define for each color class C_i, $0 \leq i \leq \chi - 1$, $t_i = \lceil \log |C_i| \rceil$ unit interval graphs, $W_i^1, \ldots, W_i^{t_i}$ in the following way: First number the vertices of C_i from 0 to $|C_i| - 1$. Let $n_i(u)$ be the number given to a vertex $u \in C_i$ as per this numbering. Now to define the unit interval graph W_i^j, for $0 \leq i \leq \chi - 1$ and $1 \leq j \leq t_i$, associate with each vertex $v \in V(G)$ an interval $f_i^j(v)$ as follows:

For each vertex $u \in V - C_i$, $\quad f_i^j(v) = [1, 2]$

For each $u \in C_i$, $f_i^j(u) = [0, 1]$ if the j-th bit in the binary representation of $n_i(u)$ is 1, else $f_i^j(u) = [2, 3]$. Define W_i^j to be the corresponding unit interval graph.

Observation 8. *For $0 \leq i \leq \chi - 1$, and $1 \leq j \leq t_i$, W_i^j is a super graph of G*

Proof. If $(u, v) \in E(G)$ then u and v do not belong to the same color class. Let $u \in C_a$ and $v \in C_b$, where $a \neq b$. Clearly one of $a, b \neq i$: Without loss of generality, let $b \neq i$. Thus $f_i^j(v) = [1, 2]$. If $a \neq i$, then $f_i^j(u) = [1, 2]$ and if $a = i$, then $f_i^j(u)$ equals either $[0, 1]$ or $[2, 3]$. In all cases, u is adjacent to v in W_i^j. It follows that W_i^j is a super graph of G. □

Claim 9.

$$\bigcap_{1 \leq i \leq \lceil \log \chi \rceil; 1 \leq j \leq 2b} U_i^j \bigcap_{0 \leq i \leq \chi - 1; 1 \leq j \leq t_i} W_i^j = G$$

.

In view of observations 7 and 8, to prove the above claim it is sufficient to show that if $(u, v) \notin E(G)$ then there exists one unit interval graph $I \in \{U_i^j : 1 \leq i \leq \lceil \log \chi \rceil ; 1 \leq j \leq 2b\} \cup \{W_i^j : 0 \leq i \leq \chi - 1; 1 \leq j \leq t_i\}$ such that u is not adjacent to v in it. We consider two cases:

Case 1 ($u, v \in C_i$, *for some* $i \in \{0, \chi - 1\}$).

Recall that we had numbered the vertices of ith color class from 0 to $|C_i| - 1$ to define the interval graphs W_i^j, for $1 \leq j \leq t_i = \lceil \log |C_i| \rceil$. Then there exists an index h, $1 \leq h \leq \lceil \log |C_j| \rceil$, such that the bit at the h-th position differs for $n_i(u)$ and $n_i(v)$. Without loss of generality assume that h-th bit in the binary representation of $n_i(u)$ is 0, and that of $n_i(v)$ is 1. Then by construction of W_i^h, $f_i^h(u) = [2, 3]$ and $f_i^h(v) = [0, 1]$. It follows that $(u, v) \notin E(W_i^h)$.

Case 2 ($u \in C_i$ *and* $v \in C_j$, *where* $i \neq j$).

Let h, $(1 \leq h \leq \lceil \log \chi \rceil)$, be a position where the binary representations of i and j differ. Without loss of generality assume that the h-th bit in the binary representation of i is 1 and the h-th bit in the binary representation of j is 0. Recalling the construction of the co-bipartite graph H_h, we have $u \in A_h$ and $v \in B_h$ and therefore $(u, v) \notin E(H_h)$. Now, from equation 1, it follows that there exists j, $1 \leq j \leq 2b$, such that in the unit interval graph U_h^j, $(u, v) \notin E(U_h^j)$.

From Claim 9 and Lemma 1, and noting that $t_i \leq \lceil \log \alpha \rceil$ for $0 \leq i \leq \chi - 1$, it immediately follows that $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2 \lceil \log \chi(G) \rceil \text{box}(G) + \chi(G) \lceil \log \alpha(G) \rceil$.

Tightness of Theorem 3 : We will show that for every $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a graph G such that $\text{cub}(G) \leq 2 \lceil \log \chi(G) \rceil \text{box}(G) + \chi(G) \lceil \log \alpha(G) \rceil \leq \text{cub}(G)(1 + \epsilon)$. Let k be a positive integer. Let T_k be the complete k-partite graph, where each part contains exactly $\frac{n}{k}$ vertices. (Assume n to be a multiple of k.) The $\text{cub}(T_k) = k \left\lceil \log \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil$. The upper bound of Theorem 3 for T_k equals $2k \lceil \log k \rceil + k \left\lceil \log \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil = \text{cub}(T_k)(1 + \frac{2\lceil \log k \rceil}{\left\lceil \log \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil}) \leq \text{cub}(T_k)(1 + \epsilon)$, provided we take $n > k^{\frac{2+\epsilon}{\epsilon}}$. Thus there exist graphs for which the upper bound given by Theorem 3 is arbitrarily close to the true value of their cubicity.

References

[1] Abhijin Adiga, Jasine Babu, and L Sunil Chandran. A constant factor approximation algorithm for boxicity of circular arc graphs. In *Algorithms and Data Structures Symposium (WADS)*, volume 6844 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, 2011.

[2] Abhijin Adiga, Jasine Babu, and L. Sunil Chandran. Polynomial time and parameterized approximation algorithms for boxicity. In *IPEC*, volume 7535 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 135–146. Springer, 2012.

[3] Abhijin Adiga, Diptendu Bhowmick, and L. Sunil Chandran. Boxicity and poset dimension. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 25(4):1687–1698, 2011.

[4] Abhijin Adiga and L. Sunil Chandran. Cubicity of interval graphs and the claw number. *J. Graph Theory*, 65:323–333, December 2010.

[5] Abhijin Adiga, L. Sunil Chandran, and Rogers Mathew. Cubicity, degeneracy and crossing number. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 35:2–12, January 2014.

[6] Abhijin Adiga, L. Sunil Chandran, and Naveen Sivadasan. Lower bounds for boxicity. *To appear in Combinatorica. CoRR*, abs/0806.3175, 2008.

[7] David Bremner, William Evans, Fabrizio Frati, L. Hayer, S. Kobourov, W. Lenhart, G. Liotta, D. Rappaport, and S. Whitesides. On representing graphs by touching cuboids. In *Graph Drawing*, pages 187–198, 2013.

[8] Parinya Chalermsook, Bundit Laekhanukit, and Danupon Nanongkai. Graph products revisited: Tight approximation hardness of induced matching, poset dimension and more. /SODA 2013, pages 1557–1576, 2013.

[9] L. Sunil Chandran, Mathew C. Francis, and Naveen Sivadasan. Boxicity and maximum degree. *J. Comb. Theory Ser. B*, 98:443–445, March 2008.

[10] L. Sunil Chandran, Mathew C. Francis, and Naveen Sivadasan. Cubicity and bandwidth. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 29(1):45–69, January 2013.

[11] L. Sunil Chandran, Carlo Mannino, and Gianpaolo Oriolo. On the cubicity of certain graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 94(3):113–118, May 2005.

[12] L. Sunil Chandran and K. Ashik Mathew. An upper bound for cubicity in terms of boxicity. *Discrete Mathematics*, 309(8):2571–2574, 2009.

[13] L. Sunil Chandran and Naveen Sivadasan. Boxicity and treewidth. *J. Comb. Theory Ser. B*, 97:733–744, September 2007.

[14] L. Sunil Chandran and Naveen Sivadasan. On the cubicity of hyper cubes. *Discrete Mathematics*, 308(23):57955800, 2008.

[15] Soumyottam Chatterjee and Shamik Ghosh. Ferrers dimension and boxicity. *Discrete Mathematics*, 310(17-18):2443–2447, September 2010.

[16] M. B. Cozzens. *Higher and multi-dimensional analogues of interval graphs*. PhD thesis, Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, 1981.

[17] Louis Esperet. Boxicity of graphs with bounded degree. *Eur. J. Comb.*, 30(5):1277–1280, 2009.

[18] Louis Esperet and Gwenael Joret. Boxicity of graphs on surfaces. *Graphs and Combinatorics*, 29(3):417–427, 2013.

[19] Stefan Felsner and Mathew C. Francis. Contact representations of planar graphs with cubes. In *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Symposium on Computational Geometry*, SoCG 2011, to appear, June 2011.

[20] Z. Fueredi and J. Kahn. On the dimensions of ordered sets of bounded degree. *Order*, 3(1):15–20, 1986.

[21] Irith Ben-Arroyo Hartman, Ilan Newman, and Ran Ziv. On grid intersection graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 87(1):41–52, 1991.

[22] Jan Kratochvíl. A special planar satisfiability problem and a consequence of its NP-completeness. *Discrete Appl. Math.*, 52(3):233–252, 1994.

[23] F. S. Roberts. On the boxicity and cubicity of a graph. In *Recent Progresses in Combinatorics*, pages 301–310. Academic Press, New York, 1969.

[24] Edward R. Scheinerman. *Intersection classes and multiple intersection parameters of graphs*. PhD thesis, Princeton University, 1984.

[25] Carsten Thomassen. Interval representations of planar graphs. *J. Comb. Theory Ser. B*, 40:9–20, 1986.

[26] Mihalis Yannakakis. The complexity of the partial order dimension problem. *SIAM J. Alg. Disc. Meth.*, 3(3):351–358, 1982.